

Judge Robart

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

NHAT HOANG TRAN,  
RASHPAL SINGH SANDHU,

Defendants.

NO. CR04-549 JLR

ORDER CONTINUING  
TRIAL DATE

This matter having come before the undersigned Court through a status conference and by oral motion of counsel, Michael Filipovic, for defendant Rashpal Singh Sandhu, for continuance of the trial date; the United States, through the United States Attorney for the Western District of Washington, Susan M. Roe and Ye-Ting Woo, Assistant United States Attorneys for said district, having no objection to the request for continuance; and defendant Nhat Tran present and through counsel, David Roberson, having joined in the request, the Court being fully advised in the matter, having heard argument of counsel, having consulted with the defendants in court, and having considered the files and records herein, now finds that

The trial for these two remaining defendants was scheduled for May 2, 2005. The defendants are waiving their speedy trial rights until August 31, 2005, which is beyond the new trial date of August 22, 2005. The motion is made on

1 several bases: nearly all of the defendants have entered guilty pleas, including  
2 five who have plead within ten days preceding this status conference. As these  
3 defendants who plead are no longer part of the upcoming trial, all parties stand in  
4 significantly different positions for trial.

5 The government must modify its case in chief to address primarily the  
6 remaining defendants. The trial will not last a month as anticipated, but may  
7 instead last one to two weeks.

8 The remaining defendants may no longer count on other defense counsel  
9 to assist in meeting the government's charges, to handle the substantial  
10 discovery, or to finish the preparations for trial.

11 There is a strong possibility that one of defendants, Nhat Tran, will resolve  
12 his charges short of trial, however, his recent uncertainty regarding counsel has  
13 delayed his resolution. At the status conference Mr. Tran affirmed retention of his  
14 current counsel and the parties now may resume discussions of resolution.  
15 Mr. Tran is in custody pending trial.

16 The other defendant, Rashpal Sandhu, is out of custody pending trial. His  
17 liberty interest is less affected by this continuance.

18 All counsel have been diligent in addressing this matter but all parties  
19 believe that this continuance is proper.

20 The continuances are necessary to ensure effective representation and  
21 continuity of counsel for the remaining defendants.

22 The Court is aware that time limitations for trial and speedy trial concerns  
23 are set forth in Title 18, United States Code, Section 3161.

24 Section 3161(h) outlines the periods of excludable time, including:

25 (8)(A) Any period of delay resulting from a continuance  
26 granted by any judge on his own motion or at the  
27 request of the defendant or his counsel or at the request  
28 of the attorney for the Government, if the judge granted  
such continuance on the basis of his findings that the  
ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh  
the best interest of the public and the defendant in a

1 speedy trial. No such period of delay resulting from a  
2 continuance granted by the court in accordance with this  
3 paragraph shall be excludable under this subsection  
4 unless the court sets forth, in the record of the case,  
5 either orally or in writing, its reasons for finding that the  
6 ends of justice served by the granting of such  
7 continuance outweigh the best interests of the public  
8 and the defendant in a speedy trial.

9 In this matter, the Court finds that further time is reasonable and necessary  
10 and that the requested time is within the speedy trial time period. Failure to grant  
11 a continuance of the trial date would likely result in a miscarriage of justice. The  
12 interests of the public and the defendants in a speedy trial in this case are  
13 outweighed by the ends of justice, although the ends of justice, especially those  
14 which deal with consideration of victims and witnesses, are not impacted by the  
15 requested continuance. This trial has few civilians witnesses, other than co-  
16 conspirators, and no known victims.

17 //

18 //

19 //

20 //

21 //

22 //

23 //

24 //

25 //

26 //

27 //

28 //

1 NOW, therefore, the trial date is continued from May 2, 2005 until  
2 August 22, 2005, and the time between this date and the new trial date be  
3 excluded pursuant to the provisions of Title 18, United States Code, Sections  
4 3161(h)(8)(A) as to each defendant.

5 Dated this 25th day of April, 2005.

6  
7 s/James L. Robart

8 

---

JAMES L. ROBART  
9 United States District Court Judge  
10

11 Presented by:

12  
13 s/Susan M. Roe  
14 SUSAN M. ROE  
15 Assistant United States Attorney  
16 WSBA 13000  
17 United States Attorney's Office  
18 700 Stewart Street, Suite 5220  
19 Seattle, WA 98101  
20 Telephone: 206/553-1077  
21 Fax: 206/553-4440  
22 E-mail: [susan.roe@usdoj.gov](mailto:susan.roe@usdoj.gov)  
23

24 s/Ye-Ting Woo  
25 YE-TING WOO  
26 Assistant United States Attorney  
27 WSBA 21208  
28 United States Attorney's Office  
700 Stewart Street, Suite 5220  
Seattle, WA 98101  
Telephone: 206/553-2268  
Fax: 206/553-4440  
E-mail: [ye-ting.woo@usdoj.gov](mailto:ye-ting.woo@usdoj.gov)